

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

District of Alaska

RECEIVED

FEB 22 2024

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
ANCHORAGE, AK

John Mun  
8149 E. 5th Ave  
Anchorage AK 99504  
907-333-9917

Plaintiff(s)

(Write the full name of each plaintiff who is filing this complaint. If the names of all the plaintiffs cannot fit in the space above, please write "see attached" in the space and attach an additional page with the full list of names.)

-v-

Valerie Robideaux, Melanie Hulbert, Chancellor Sean Parnell of the University of Alaska Anchorage, and President Pat Pitney the University of Alaska System

Defendant(s)

(Write the full name of each defendant who is being sued. If the names of all the defendants cannot fit in the space above, please write "see attached" in the space and attach an additional page with the full list of names. Do not include addresses here.)

Case No.

3:24-cv-00040-JMK

(to be filled in by the Clerk's Office)

Jury Trial: (check one) ☒ Yes ☐ No

COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS  
(Non-Prisoner Complaint)

NOTICE

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 5.2 addresses the privacy and security concerns resulting from public access to electronic court files. Under this rule, papers filed with the court should *not* contain: an individual's full social security number or full birth date; the full name of a person known to be a minor; or a complete financial account number. A filing may include *only*: the last four digits of a social security number; the year of an individual's birth; a minor's initials; and the last four digits of a financial account number.

Except as noted in this form, plaintiff need not send exhibits, affidavits, grievance or witness statements, or any other materials to the Clerk's Office with this complaint.

In order for your complaint to be filed, it must be accompanied by the filing fee or an application to proceed in forma pauperis.

**I. The Parties to This Complaint****A. The Plaintiff(s)**

Provide the information below for each plaintiff named in the complaint. Attach additional pages if needed.

Name	John Mun		
Address	8149 E. 5th Ave		
	Anchorage	AK	99504
	<i>City</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Zip Code</i>
County			
Telephone Number	907-333-9917		
E-Mail Address	john.c.mun@gmail.com		

**B. The Defendant(s)**

Provide the information below for each defendant named in the complaint, whether the defendant is an individual, a government agency, an organization, or a corporation. For an individual defendant, include the person's job or title (if known) and check whether you are bringing this complaint against them in their individual capacity or official capacity, or both. Attach additional pages if needed.

**Defendant No. 1**

Name	Valerie B. Robideaux		
Job or Title <i>(if known)</i>	Interim Executive Director of Advising		
Address	9740 Hillside Drive		
	Anchorage	AK	99507
	<i>City</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Zip Code</i>
County			
Telephone Number	907-786-0345		
E-Mail Address <i>(if known)</i>	vbrobideaux@alaska.edu		
<input type="checkbox"/> Individual capacity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Official capacity			

**Defendant No. 2**

Name	Melanie A. Hulbert		
Job or Title <i>(if known)</i>	Vice Provost of Student Success and Dean of the Honors College		
Address	2030 STURBRIDGE CIR		
	Anchorage	AK	99507
	<i>City</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Zip Code</i>
County			
Telephone Number	907-786-1566		
E-Mail Address <i>(if known)</i>	mahulbert@alaska.edu		
<input type="checkbox"/> Individual capacity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Official capacity			

## Defendant No. 3

Name

Sean Parnell

Job or Title *(if known)*

Chancellor of the University of Alaska Anchorage

Address

3211 Providence Dr.

Anchorage

AK

88508

City

State

Zip Code

County

Telephone Number

907-786-1437

E-Mail Address *(if known)*

uaa\_chancellor@alaska.edu

☐

Individual capacity

☒

Official capacity

## Defendant No. 4

Name

Pat Pitney

Job or Title *(if known)*

President of the University of Alaska System

Address

PO Box 755000

Fairbanks

AK

99775

City

State

Zip Code

County

Telephone Number

907-450-8009

E-Mail Address *(if known)*

kppitney@alaska.edu

☐

Individual capacity

☒

Official capacity

## II. Basis for Jurisdiction

Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, you may sue state or local officials for the “deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and [federal laws].” Under *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), you may sue federal officials for the violation of certain constitutional rights.

A. Are you bringing suit against *(check all that apply)*:

☐Federal officials (a *Bivens* claim)☒

State or local officials (a § 1983 claim)

B. Section 1983 allows claims alleging the “deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and [federal laws].” 42 U.S.C. § 1983. If you are suing under section 1983, what federal constitutional or statutory right(s) do you claim is/are being violated by state or local officials? Amendments XIV and XX of the U.S. Constitution Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, Title I of the Americans with Disability Act of 1990, Section 102 and 103 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, and Sections 501 and 505 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

C. Plaintiffs suing under *Bivens* may only recover for the violation of certain constitutional rights. If you are suing under *Bivens*, what constitutional right(s) do you claim is/are being violated by federal officials?

Amendment XIV and XX of the U.S. Constitution  
Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, Title I of the Americans with Disability Act of 1990, Section 102 and 103 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, and Sections 501 and 505 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

---

- D. Section 1983 allows defendants to be found liable only when they have acted “under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia.” 42 U.S.C. § 1983. If you are suing under section 1983, explain how each defendant acted under color of state or local law. If you are suing under *Bivens*, explain how each defendant acted under color of federal law. Attach additional pages if needed.  
Please see Attached section on Abuse of Power
- 

### III. Statement of Claim

State as briefly as possible the facts of your case. Describe how each defendant was personally involved in the alleged wrongful action, along with the dates and locations of all relevant events. You may wish to include further details such as the names of other persons involved in the events giving rise to your claims. Do not cite any cases or statutes. If more than one claim is asserted, number each claim and write a short and plain statement of each claim in a separate paragraph. Attach additional pages if needed.

- A. Where did the events giving rise to your claim(s) occur?  
The University of Alaska Anchorage at the Anchorage Alaska Campus and online through Zoom meetings
- 
- B. What date and approximate time did the events giving rise to your claim(s) occur?  
Valerie Robideaux roughly 2019 to December 2024  
Melanie Hulbert Fall 2022 semester to December 2024  
Sean Parnell 2024  
Pat Pitney 2024
- 
- C. What are the facts underlying your claim(s)? *(For example: What happened to you? Who did what? Was anyone else involved? Who else saw what happened?)*  
Please see attached additional information section III.C.
-

#### **IV. Injuries**

If you sustained injuries related to the events alleged above, describe your injuries and state what medical treatment, if any, you required and did or did not receive.

To include but not limited to:

Lost Salary  
Lost Annual Leave  
Lost Sick Leave  
Pension Salary will be lesser  
An annuity plan contributions  
Mental Health Help  
Personal Reputation  
Professional Reputation  
Malicious Slander  
Pain and Suffering

---

#### **V. Relief**

State briefly what you want the court to do for you. Make no legal arguments. Do not cite any cases or statutes. If requesting money damages, include the amounts of any actual damages and/or punitive damages claimed for the acts alleged. Explain the basis for these claims.

To include but not limited to:

Reinstatement to my position as Director of Advising  
Back Pay  
Annual Leave  
Sick Leave  
Mental Anguish  
Pain and Suffering  
Court Cost



Complaint for Violation of Civil Rights  
Attached Additional Information for:

II.D How there was Abuse of Power

The University's abuse of power stems from the actions of Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert to use university resources with their lies, and the University Hearing revealed acts of perjury by them, to carry out their arbitrary, capacious, discriminatory, retaliatory, and other illegal treatment against myself that cumulated in my protest of their decision and its affirmation by Chancellor Sean Parnell and President Pat Pitney, that ultimately ended with my termination.

But no matter what evidence of perjury, the false testimony I could show to different university offices, including the University's Hearing Officer that were committed by Valerie Robideaux, Melanie Hulbert, and their witnesses as well from their favorites like Whitney Flores. And it continued and was falsely upheld by Chancellor Sean Parnell and President Pat Pitney, denying an appropriate response to all the lies and perjury by Valerie Robideaux, Melanie Hulbert, their witnesses, and their favorite Caucasian employees. The university offices only affirmed the lies of Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert and failed in their duty.

It did not matter what evidence of perjury I provided because the outcome was already decided before any process was started. Just at how many times the University repeatedly doubted the perjury statement from Whitney Flores was arbitrary and capricious even though I had Whitney Flores' own email showing her perjury. The University kept denying it because it didn't fit their false narrative. The University would even whole heartedly embrace Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert's false accusations even though University's own documents show Valerie Robideaux admitted she had no witnesses and evidence to support her false allegations against me.

The University itself with its processes, clearly designed and rigged by its attorneys are equally at fault for having set the table for such abusive behavior by Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert to take place not just unchecked, but fully supported by the university. How is it that Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert were able to benefits from the vast resources of the university, including the General Counsel office with its army of attorneys and I'm left in the wasteland fending for myself.



Valerie Robideaux completely disregarded any of my non-Caucasian concerns like feeling completely disenfranchised by her supervision and leadership, which was also the sentiment of the only other non-Caucasian Directors of Advising at the time, Lynda Hernandez. This can be verified from the audio recording of the University of Alaska's Hearing process and Lynda Hernandez's testimony.

Valerie Robideaux went further to recruit others: co-worker friends and her Caucasian favorite employees, those in her and Melanie Hulbert's clique to even provide false perjury testimony about how I was upset and accusatory about something that never happened. What actually happened was, Valerie Robideaux and Whitney Flores accused me of lying and denied they decided who the chairs of the subcommittees were, but 1) Whitney Flores's own email show she committed perjury and it was Valerie Robideaux and Whitney Flores decided who the chairs of the subcommittees were, but the true weight of such evidence is dismissed by the University offices and the Hearing Officer.

I even discovered at the University Hearing that there were so-called evidence or information the University was using against me to come to their rigged decision, but they never even let me know about the evidence, which is further testament to how rigged the university's processes are, giving a sham of a due process.

Valerie Robideaux would use her lies and perjury to marshal university resources against me, the Human Resources office and Diversity and Compliance Office.

Other individuals also providing perjury statements in favor of Valerie Robideaux include: 1) Valerie Robideaux's supervisor Melanie Hulbert who like Valerie Robideaux committed perjury by denying she has never had a non-Caucasian feel disenfranchised by her supervision and leadership, and also like Valerie Robideaux completely denied I expressed concerns of feeling disenfranchised by her and Valerie Robideaux's supervision and leadership. I also point out Valerie Robideaux's and Melanie Hulbert perjury statement is completely revealed by Lynda Hernandez who testified under oath it was odd Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert denied ever having a non-Caucasian feel disenfranchised or spoke with them about feeling disenfranchised because she has cried in total 4-times in front of them because of feeling disenfranchised by their supervision and leadership.

Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert are committing perjury or do both care so little about non-Caucasian employees concerns that they cannot even remember an employee who cried 4-times in front of them for being disenfranchised.



With such lies and perjury, which were revealed at the University Hearing, Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert utilized university resources with their false complaints against me to the Diversity and Compliance office and Human Resources that ultimately ended in the unlawful termination of my employment.

In further proof of the lies and perjury that Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert garnered against me, which again is information only revealed to me for the first time at the University Hearing. Information the University was using against me like, John Petraitis, husband of Valerie Robideaux's former supervisor, Claudia Lampman, and father to Abbie Lampman who Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert have shown strong favoritism towards, including having Abbie Lampman be one of two finalists for a Director of Advising position in only her second year on the job as an advisor, which I have pointed out to John Petraitis' anger. John Petraitis' perjury statements include an advisor I supervised, David House 1) who he claims told him that my weekly team meetings were like a weekly team beating. Fortunately, David House was one of my witnesses at the University Hearing and he testified under oath that he never told John Petraitis any such thing, and David House pointed out how John Petraitis was not the good person he first thought John Petraitis to be. John Petraitis even went further in his perjury testimony and testified 2) how I constantly circumvented my then supervisor, Patricia Linton's authority, but again I was fortunate enough to have Patricia Linton as one of my witnesses at the University Hearing and she completely denied such insubordination happened. In fact, she is completely shocked by the accusations because that is completely opposite of who she knows me to be. All this can be verified in the audio recording of the University's Hearing.

Though Valerie Robideaux admitted in a false complaint she filed against me where documents the University presented as final findings included that 1) Valerie Robideaux admitted she did not have any evidence or witnesses to support her false accusations against me so it is clear her dislike and hatred of me compelled her to file her complaint, and 2) the date of her complaint against me which included complaints I was insubordinate to her supervision occurred even prior to her becoming my supervisor. Her hatred against me is so great that it did not even matter to Valerie Robideaux that she was not my supervisor. She abused her position by filing a false complaint, marshalling the university resources of Human Resources and the Diversity and Compliance office.

With blatant lies, including perjury statements, Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert weaponized university resources to terminate my employment with the

university which I contend was for wrongful, discriminatory, retaliatory, and for other illegal reasons. For example, according to the final findings from the University's diversity's office that even though Valerie Robideaux acknowledged she had no witnesses and evidence, the University's diversity office completely gave no weight to evidence I had showing perjury statements from Valerie Robideaux, Melanie Hulbert, and Whitney Flores with her own email. The legitimate evidence and witnesses I had did not matter.

The University offices like HR, the Diversity and Compliance office, and the University Hearing would also dismiss my evidence and concerns, including another one of Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert's favorites, Mike Detmer who made fun of my accent and about how I have difficulty saying certain words because of my accent, words difficult for me like pacific and specific as well as whole and ho. I can be blatantly and racially made fun of in the office and it does not matter to the university's HR office. Mike Detmer clearly acted out against me because he has witnessed how poorly Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert treat me, like my humanity does not even matter.

Under these and other false reasons Valerie Robideaux with assistance with Melanie Hulbert utilized University resources to terminate my employment for wrongful and illegal reasons.

It was revealed in the University's Diversity and Compliance office process Melanie Hulbert acknowledged that from when she first started her employment, Valerie Robideaux already told her hearsay rumors, gossip, and lies about me, where Valerie Robideaux was clearly badmouthing me behind my back for years before I even knew about it.

Melanie Hulbert believed the lies from Valerie Robideaux that I was a horrible worker, supervisor, and person, a misogynist. I was already damned in Melanie Hulbert's eyes even before I met her because Valerie Robideaux badmouthed me behind my back. Melanie Hulbert clearly rather believes in hearsay gossip than speak directly with me. Nobody else but Valerie Robideaux would be in position to provide such hearsay gossip about me to Melanie Hulbert. This despite the entire university world outside of those connected to them saying otherwise for nearly 30 years. These individuals, if it wasn't Valerie Robideaux, all rushed to tell things to Melanie Hulbert, about me from the start, like I was more important than work, and if it wasn't Valerie Robideaux, why are others who do not know me badmouthing me behind my back, which is certainly further telling of the very

hostile work environment I had to work in despite expressing my concerns to the University's Human Resources and the Diversity and Compliance office.

From the start, Melanie Hulbert disenfranchised me and completely ignored all of my concerns, including all of my non-Caucasian concerns. She even clearly committed perjury like Valerie Robideaux that she has never had, including ever having a conversation with a non-Caucasian employee about feeling disenfranchised, but Lynda Hernandez's sworn testimony stated that she cried in total 4-times in front of Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert. And I guess it is obvious that me as a non-Caucasian expressing my concerns, reasons for which we are here now, does not seem to count for either Valerie Robideaux or Melanie Hulbert as a non-Caucasian expressing non-Caucasian concerns about feeling disenfranchised. Or does concerns of non-Caucasians mean so little that they could actually and totally forget about Lynda Hernandez, an employee who had cried a total of 4-times in front of them because of how disenfranchised she felt? The perjury is so blatant that it drips from the lips of Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert when they are not speaking.

Chancellor Sean Parnell abused his authority in his capacity as Chancellor and affirmed the rigged process with lies and perjury rather than take seriously my evidence of perjury by Valerie Robideaux, Melanie Hulbert, and their witnesses and call for a true investigation that is done by a group not biased towards university or on the university's payroll which creates a conflict of interest.

President Pat Pitney abused her authority in her capacity affirmed the rigged process with lies and perjury rather than take seriously my evidence of perjury by Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert and their witnesses and call for a true investigation that is done by a group not biased towards the university or on the university's payroll which creates a conflict of interest.

When one rigged university process affirms another rigged university process, what chance does a non-Caucasian employee in the right have. There is no genuine true due process to have my concerns investigated or my due process rights truly upheld. The University was presenting evidence that they never shared with me on the day of the University Hearing. What is right about such behavior by the University?

### III. Statement of Claim

III.C What are the facts underlying your claims? (For example: What happened to you, who did what, was anyone else involved, who else saw what happened)

In addition to what is explained above in the abuse of power section:

Valerie Robideaux from when she first started in her position as Director of Success onto her current position as Interim Executive Director of Advising, and by the way Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert direct appointed Joseph Bruner as Director of Student Success without any competition or even posting the position so that Valerie Robideaux has no Director of Student Success to return to, which makes it even clearer that Melanie Hulbert plans to name Valerie Robideaux the permanent Executive Director of Advising. And this is after my one-on-one interview with Melanie Hulbert for the Executive Director of Advising, which she failed right afterwards. Valerie Robideaux has constantly treated me in ways that I always felt disenfranchised by her supervision and leadership.

There is a lot of evidence against Valerie Robideaux about her treatment towards me, including perjury. For example, at the University's Hearing she denied that I ever offered to provide extra help and show care and concern towards her, but I have email evidence that shows I expressed concern and offered her help. The fact that Valerie Robideaux completely shoves aside and ignores anything showing me in good light is because of her hatred and the unreasonable feelings she has towards me, shows the degree to which Valerie Robideaux is in complete denial.

It was revealed in the University's final findings from her false complaint to the University's Diversity and Compliance Office that even though she had no witnesses and evidence, she still filed a complaint against me. This is also evidence of a rigged university process that the Diversity and Compliance office still accepted Valerie Robideaux's complaint with these glaring admissions. This shows to the degree in which the University processes are rigged to have the outcome the University wants regardless of the facts.

Valerie Robideaux would disenfranchise me in many ways including when she completely ignored how I volunteered to chair in essence any of the subcommittees, but she would then twist this into another fabrication of her lies and false accusations, where she and Whitney Flores claimed what I said was a lie and I was acting out this way because the decision came from young women, when Whitney Flores' own emails show how she and Valerie Robideaux are both committing perjury about this fact.

Valerie Robideaux and eventually Melanie Hulbert completely dismissed and ignored any non-Caucasian concerns I had such as feeling disenfranchised from their supervision and leadership, pushed to the margins like my thoughts and opinions do not matter. And Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert would completely deny this including committing perjury by stating the two have never had a non-Caucasian feel disenfranchised by their leadership and supervision. I guess I do not count as a non-Caucasian in their eyes. Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert went further with their perjury by stating that they have also never had a conversation with any non-Caucasian about feeling disenfranchised when again, Lynda Hernandez testified under oath that she has cried in total 4-times in front of Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert because she felt so disenfranchised.

Even though we are here because of how disenfranchised Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert have made me feel, they are still denying there has ever been a non-Caucasian who felt this way or have a conversation with them. Why does what Lynda Hernandez and I feel matter so little to them they deny these are concerns we have expressed to them. And of course, in the University's rigged processes, it always sides with the Caucasian supervisors. Lynda Hernandez has no reason to commit perjury for me.

Not only have Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert committed perjury, several individuals with direct connections to them have also provided perjury testimony on behalf of Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert.

To name couple: John Petraitis, husband of Valerie Robideaux's former supervisor and father of Abbie Lampman who Valerie Robideaux has shown strong favoritism towards by having Abbie Lampman be one of two finalists for the Director of Advising position in only Abbie's second year as an advisor. The other finalist given the position was Whitney Flores who I have already shown committed perjury about who selected the chairs of the subcommittees with Whitney Flores' own email.

John Petraitis also committed perjury that I constantly circumvented my then supervisor's, Patricia Linton, authority, but again I was fortunate to have Patricia Linton as one of my witnesses and she testified I did not circumvent her supervision.

John Petraitis committed another act of perjury when he testified that David House an advisor, I used to supervise told him that my weekly team meetings were



weekly team beatings. But David House was one of my witnesses at the University Hearing, and David House testified he never told John Petraitis any such thing, and my team meeting were a warm comfortable safe place just as another one of my witnesses testified to, Leslie Olberding who was another advisor I supervised. David House even testified that John Petraitis was not the good person he thought John Petraitis was.

I also had other witnesses that further collaborated my understanding of who Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert are. For example, Valerie Svancara testified that Valerie Robideaux always had favorites and they were always Caucasians. And even though Valerie Svancara was named by Valerie Robideaux to be chair of the Diversity subcommittee, Valerie Robideaux never allowed her to do any work on the Diversity subcommittee. A pattern is clearly visible.

Another witness for Valerie Robideaux who committed perjury during the University's Hearing was Tim Smith who testified that my team meetings were a cutthroat environment where I pitted advisor against advisor. But again, testimony by two of my former advisors who are still advisors for the UAA, David House and Leslie Olberding, testified my team meetings were anything but, and the team meetings were warm, inviting, and a very safe place for them to say whatever they wanted.

Melanie Hulbert also made me feel disenfranchised from the time she first started. In my interview for Executive Director of Advising, where the first interview was oddly a one-on-one interview with her rather than a committee first. Melanie Hulbert of course failed the search and named Valerie Robideaux the interim Executive Director of Advising. Even before I said one single word Melanie Hulbert sent clear signals her decision was made, and it was not me but Valerie Robideaux.

It is clear by Melanie Hulbert approving Joseph Bruner to be Director of Student Success, which was the position Valerie Robideaux had prior to being named interim Executive Director so that Valerie Robideaux no longer has her former position to return to. Melanie Hulbert plans to name Valerie Robideaux the permanent Executive Director of Advising. How is it that there are always these appointments without competition and no department or individual providing a check and balance.

Melanie Hulbert is also another one who has committed acts of perjury like denying like Valerie Robideaux that she has never had a non-Caucasian feel

disenfranchised from her supervision, or a conversation with a non-Caucasian about feeling disenfranchised by her supervision and leadership. Why do Lynda Hernandez and I not count in their eyes?

This absolute denial by Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert of never having a single non-Caucasian ever feel disenfranchised is pretty farfetched in that they certainly did not interview all non-Caucasian employees and ask all of them if they feel disenfranchised. I believe such absolute denial is proof in itself that Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert are committing perjury. My sworn testimony along with Lynda Hernandez certain say what exactly Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert are doing.

With lies and perjury, Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert, weaponized the rigged university resources like Human Resources and the Diversity and Compliance office to railroad me and terminate my employment with the university.

The university processes are clearly rigged based upon such acts by the university to accept without question Valerie Robideaux false complaint even though the final findings from the University's Diversity and Compliance office stated Valerie Robideaux admitted she had no witnesses or evidence to back up her false claims against me. But the Diversity and Compliance still accepted the complaint and, in the process would dismiss or give no weight to my evidence showing how Valerie Robideaux, Melanie Hulbert, and Whitney Flores committed blatant perjury. The HR office didn't even want to remotely consider Mike Detmer was making fun of the way I pronounce certain words because of my accent, words like pacific and specific or whole and ho. The University processes just ignored anything that does not fit their false narrative.

The University's rigged process is very dangerous considering a habitual practice of rigging all processes, so the outcome is how the university wants things. Why else would university processes ignore such strong evidence of perjury by Valerie Robideaux and Melanie Hulbert along with their witnesses? How many ways must I show they, Valerie Robideaux, Melanie Hulbert, Whitney Flores, John Petraitis, and others are all committing perjury?

In my filing with the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, I turned in an essay, a thesis that was over 100-pages with over 100 exhibits.